```
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 1
 2
                     FOR THE DISTRICT OF HAWAI'I
 3
     SYNAGRO TECHNOLOGIES,
     INC.,
 4
 5
                 Plaintiff,
 6
                vs.
                                    ) CIVIL NO.
 7
     GMP HAWAII, INC.,
                                    ) CV04-00509 SPK LEK
 8
                  Defendant.
 9
10
11
             DEPOSITION OF WAGDY A. GUIRGUIS, P.E.
12
13
          Taken on behalf of Plaintiff SYNAGRO TECHNOLOGIES.
     INC., at the offices of Alston Hunt Floyd & Ing, ASB
14
     Tower, 1001 Bishop Street, 18th Floor, Honolulu,
15
16
    Hawaii, commencing at 9:04 a.m., Monday, September 19,
     2005, pursuant to Notice.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
    BEFORE: ELSIE TERADA, CSR NO. 437
25
              Certified Shorthand Reporter
```



```
1
     APPEARANCES:
 2
     For Plaintiff SYNAGRO TECHNOLOGIES, INC.:
 3
 4
             MEI-FEI KUO, ESQ.
Alston Hunt Floyd & Ing
             American Savings Bank Tower
 5
             1001 Bishop Street, 18th Floor
 6
             Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
              (808) 524-1800
 7
     For Defendant GMP HAWAII, INC.:
 8
             RICHARD C. SUTTON, JR., ESQ.
 9
             Sakai Iwanaga Sutton Law Group
             City Financial Tower, Suite 2307
             201 Merchant Street
10
             Honolulu, Hawaii 96813-2929 (808) 792-3888
11
12
13
     ALSO PRESENT:
14
             DANIEL HABIB, ESQ.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

```
Okay. And so the inclusion of -- and have
 1
 2
     you had a chance yet to read Exhibit 15?
 3
          Α
               Uh-huh.
               Exhibit 15 is an accurate copy of Change
 4
 5
     Order 1.
               Have you seen this document before today?
               Long time ago, but I have seen it, yes.
 6
 7
               Okay. I want to take your attention to the
 8
     attachment that's on GMP - 184. Do you see the
     reference here to 200,000, and it says, "Additional
 9
10
     construction management services by GMP"? Right here
11
     (indicating).
12
          Α
               Yes.
13
               Okay. This insertion here, who had put that
     in? At whose request was that included in this change
14
15
     order?
16
          Α
               I have no idea, but this internal work by
     Synagro.
17
18
          Q
               Okay. How did they arrive at the $200,000
19
     amount?
20
               From my recollection, they had 4-, 500,000
     available initially, to start with. Was how much?
21
22
     600,000.
23
         MR. SUTTON: (Indicating.)
         THE WITNESS: Construction management.
24
25
         MR. SUTTON: Yes.
```

Page 4 of 8

```
1
          THE WITNESS: 600,000.
 2
          MR. SUTTON: 6460.
          THE WITNESS: 646- initially.
 3
          MS. KUO: Uh-huh.
 4
 5
          THE WITNESS: And we said that's not enough
 6
     because our fee proposal was much higher than that, so
 7
     they added 200,000 more.
 8
                (BY MS. KUO): Okay. And so that's how that
 9
     figure, your understanding?
10
               Yeah.
               So this document here, this change order,
11
     this is not a final document. It still needs to be
12
     approved by the City; correct?
13
14
               That is correct.
15
               And do you have any understanding of whether
     or not this additional amount for 200,000 for
16
     construction management was ever approved by the city?
17
18
          A ` I have no idea.
19
               Okay. I want to show you Exhibit 16 to Peter
     Melnyk's deposition.
20
21
          Α
               Uh-huh.
22
               And if you look at, this is an e-mail, a
    June 5th e-mail from the city, Steven Serikaku, to
23
24
    Connie Reynolds and Jim Hecht of Synagro. And if you
25
    go down towards the middle, it states, "We also provide
```

```
the following comments: The $200,000 cost for
 1
     additional management shall be deleted."
 2
 3
               Do you see that?
          Α
 4
               Yes.
               So, did you ever receive any type of
 5
     appropriation from the city to provide construction
 6
 7
     management work?
 8
               We don't work for the city. We don't work
     for the city. We work for Synagro.
 9
               Okay. Did you ever receive any type of -- on
10
     construction management, what were the terms that were
11
12
     discussed between Synagro and GMP?
               We have submitted our fee proposal, was an
13
     excess of 700,000.
14
15
               Let me show you Exhibit No. 5. Is this what
     you are calling your, quote-unquote, fee proposal?
16
17
          MR. SUTTON: Exhibit 5 is document GMP - 0176.
          THE WITNESS: "Yes, and that's the portion of the
18
    construction management, if you add the 400- plus the
19
    300-, that comes to over the 700,000.
20
21
               (BY MS. KUO): Okay. I want to show you
    here, though, it says: Peter Melnyk asked me to e-mail
22
    you the following regarding your engineering fee
23
    proposal. And later on down here, it says: Under
24
25
    construction management GMP proposes.
```

```
upon one thing -- I mean, I'm still confused, based on
 1
 2
     the presentations and the work?
 3
               Based on the representation of Synagro that
     GMP is the engineer for the team.
 4
 5
               Okay. I also wanted to -- hold on a second.
     I'd like to next go to the compensation issue. You
 6
     have here, the total design expenses is approximately
 7
     2,683,422 for the said contract. You're talking about
 8
 9
     the implied contract, right?
          MR. SUTTON: Which contract?
10
          MS. KUO: Well, I'm going by the counterclaim. He
11
     says the total of the design expenses is approximately
12
13
     2,683,422 for the said contract.
               (BY MS. KUO): What contract are you
14
     referring to? Right here.
15
16
               That's number what?
17
               No. 1, Paragraph 12 of the counterclaim
     that's attached as Exhibit 3 to Melnyk's depo.
18
19
         MR. SUTTON: You're answering her question on
20
    Paragraph 12, as to what contract this is.
         THE WITNESS: From what I see right now, it
21
    appears to be the implied contract.
22
23
               (BY MS. KUO): Okay. And what is this figure
24
    based on, the 2 million six hundred eighty-three?
25
              Yeah. Based on what they negotiated.
```

```
1
          Q
               So all of these figures are based on industry
 2
     standards?
 3
               That is correct.
 4
               Just two more things I want to cover with the
     claim and then you can go. We can come back and
 5
     continue in the afternoon.
 7
          Α
               Sure.
 8
               You have in here, on Paragraph 14, that: As
 9
     a result, Defendant is entitled to damages including
     profits from the contract plus costs.
10
11
               What are you talking about profits?
               Profits of the engineering and the
12
13
     construction management.
14
               So it's basically these figures here?
15
          Α
               That is correct.
               Not an additional profit, right?
16
17
          Α
               That's the profit for this project.
18
          0
               And the last thing was, you also have a
19
     Count II here, for punitive damage, what's the basis pf
20
     this claim here?
21
          Α
               Where is that? I think this is a legal --
22
         MR. SUTTON: You can give the factual basis for
23
     it.
24
         THE WITNESS: So what's the question?
25
               (BY MS. KUO): My question is, what's the
```

```
1
                     CERTIFICATE
 2
     STATE OF HAWAII
                                      SS.
 3
     CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU
 4
 5
               I, ELSIE TERADA, do hereby certify;
 6
               That on September 19, 2005, at 9:04 a.m.
     appeared before me WAGDY A. GUIRGUIS, P.E., the witness
 7
     whose deposition is contained herein; that prior to
 8
     being examined he was by me duly sworn;
 9
10
                That the deposition was taken down by me in
     machine shorthand and was thereafter reduced to
11
     typewritten form under my supervision; that the
12
     foregoing represents, to the best of my ability, a true
13
     and correct transcript of the proceedings had in the
14
15
     foregoing matter.
16
                 I further certify that I am not attorney
     for any of the parties hereto, nor in any way concerned
17
18
     with the cause.
19
                 DATED this 30th day of September, 2005, in
20
    Honolulu, Hawaii.
21
22
23
24
    ELSIE TERADA, CSR NO. 437
    Notary Public, State of Hawaii
25
    My Commission Expires:
                            4-07-2006
                  RALPH ROSENBERG COURT REPORTERS
```